FAX TRANSMITTAL COVER SHEET

ORIGINAL WILL FOLLOW VIA:
☐ MAIL
☐ INTERNATIONAL AIRMAIL
☐ COURIER
☒ WILL NOT FOLLOW
☐ HAND DELIVERY
☐ WITH ENCLOSURE(S)
☐ WITHOUT ENCLOSURE(S)

CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
600 Travis, Suite 7100
Houston, Texas 77002
Fax Number: (713) 238-8008
Telephone Number: (713) 238-8000

PLEASE DELIVER THE FOLLOWING PAGES IMMEDIATELY TO:

NAME: **BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

FIRM: **U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

CITY: **ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA**

FAX NO: **(703) 872-9306**

REMARKS: **Serial No. 09/483,063, filed 01/14/2000**
Attached hereto is an Appeal Brief for filing with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. Please acknowledge receipt of this facsimile.

Total Number of Pages (Including This One): **TWENTY-EIGHT (28)**

FROM: Alan D. Christenson, Direct Dial No. (713) 632-1615

DATE: November 16, 2004

CLIENT/MATTER NO. 200304309-1 (1662-15100)

IF YOU DO NOT RECEIVE ALL THE PAGES,
PLEASE CALL BACK AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

@002/028

PATENT APPLICATION

ORIGINAL   ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. __200304309-1__

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P. O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

IN THE
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor(s): Ker Sze TOH et al.	Confirmation No.: 7851
Application No.: 09/483,063	Examiner: Minh Dinh
Filing Date: 01/14/2000	Group Art Unit: 2132
Title: SOFTWARE DELIVERY SYSTEM	

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner For Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF

Sir:

Transmitted herewith is the Appeal Brief in this application with respect to the Notice of Appeal filed on __09/16/2004__ .

The fee for filing this Appeal Brief is (37 CFR 1.17(c)) $340.00.

(complete (a) or (b) as applicable)

The proceedings herein are for a patent application and the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) apply.

( ) (a) Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 (fees: 37 CFR 1.17(a)-(d) for the total number of months checked below:

      ( ) one month $110.00
      ( ) two months $430.00
      ( ) three months $980.00
      ( ) four months $1530.00

    ( ) The extension fee has already been filled in this application.

(X) (b) Applicant believes that no extension of time is required. However, this conditional petition is being made to provide for the possibility that applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for a petition and fee for extension of time.

Please charge to Deposit Account 08-2025 the sum of __$340.00__. At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account 08-2025 pursuant to 37 CFR 1.25. Additionally please charge any fees to Deposit Account 08-2025 under 37 CFR 1.16 through 1.21 inclusive, and any other sections in Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations that may regulate fees. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

( ) I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. Date of Deposit:_____
OR
(X) I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office facsimile number (703) 872-9306 on __11/16/2004__

Number of pages: 27

Typed Name: Colleen F. Brown

Signature: _Colleen F. Brown_

Respectfully submitted,

Ker Sze TOH et al.

By _____

Alan D. Christenson

Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 54,036

Date: 11/16/2004

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P. O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

COPY

PATENT APPLICATION

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. __200304309-1__

IN THE
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor(s): Ker Sze TOH et al.

Application No.: 09/483,063

Filing Date: 01/14/2000

Title: SOFTWARE DELIVERY SYSTEM

Confirmation No.: 7851

Examiner: Minh Dinh

Group Art Unit: 2132

Mall Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner For Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF

Sir:

Transmitted herewith is the Appeal Brief in this application with respect to the Notice of Appeal filed on __09/16/2004__.

The fee for filing this Appeal Brief is (37 CFR 1.17(c)) $340.00.

(complete (a) or (b) as applicable)

The proceedings herein are for a patent application and the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) apply.

( ) (a) Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 (fees: 37 CFR 1.17(a)-(d) for the total number of months checked below:

( ) one month $110.00
( ) two months $430.00
( ) three months $980.00
( ) four months $1630.00

( ) The extension fee has already been filled in this application.

(X) (b) Applicant believes that no extension of time is required. However, this conditional petition is being made to provide for the possibility that applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for a petition and fee for extension of time.

Please charge to Deposit Account 08-2025 the sum of __$340.00__. At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account 08-2025 pursuant to 37 CFR 1.25. Additionally please charge any fees to Deposit Account 08-2025 under 37 CFR 1.16 through 1.21 inclusive, and any other sections in Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations that may regulate fees. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

( ) I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mall in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. Date of Deposit:_____
OR
(X) I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office facsimile number __(703) 872-9306__ on __11/16/2004__

Number of pages: 27

Typed Name: Colleen F. Brown

Respectfully submitted,

Ker Sze TOH et al.

By _____

Alan D. Christenson
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 54,036

Date: 11/16/2004

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 1 6 2004

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appellants:	Ker Sze TOH et al.	§	Confirmation No.:	7851
Serial No.:	09/483,063	§	Group Art Unit:	2132
Filed:	01/14/2000	§	Examiner:	Minh Dinh
For:	Software Delivery System	§	Docket No.:	200304309-1

APPEAL BRIEF

Mall Stop Appeal Brief – Patents
Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Date: November 16, 2004

Sir:

Appellants hereby submit this Appeal Brief in connection with the above-identified application. A Notice of Appeal was filed via facsimile on September 16, 2004.

Appl. No. 09/483,063
Appeal Brief dated November 16, 2004
Reply to final Office action of June 23, 2004

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Appl. No. 09/483,063
Appeal Brief dated November 16, 2004
Reply to final Office action of June 23, 2004

I.   **REAL PARTY IN INTEREST**

The real party in interest is the Hewlett-Packard Development Company (HPDC), a Texas Limited Partnership, having a principal place of business in Houston, Texas, through its merger with Compaq Computer Corporation (CCC) which owned Compaq Information Technologies Group, L.P. (CITG). The assignment from the CCC to CITG was recorded on January 18, 2002, at Reel/Frame 012553/0612. The Change of Name document was recorded on December 2, 2003, at Reel/Frame 014177/0428.

136609.01/1662.13100   Page 3 of 25   HP PDNO 200304308-1

PAGE 6/28 * RCVD AT 11/16/2004 3:25:29 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/4 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:7132388008 * DURATION (mm-ss):07-50

Appl. No. 09/483,063
Appeal Brief dated November 16, 2004
Reply to final Office action of June 23, 2004

II.   RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Appellants are unaware of any related appeals or interferences.

Appl. No. 09/483,063
Appeal Brief dated November 16, 2004
Reply to final Office action of June 23, 2004

III.   **STATUS OF THE CLAIMS**

Originally filed claims: 1-19.

Claim cancellations: None.

Added claims: 20-25.

Presently pending claims: 1-25.

Presently appealed claims: 1-25.

138609.01/1662.15100   Page 5 of 25   HP PDNO 200304309-1

PAGE 8/28 * RCVD AT 11/16/2004 3:25:29 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/4 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:7132388008 * DURATION (mm-ss):07-50

Appl. No. 09/483,063
Appeal Brief dated November 16, 2004
Reply to final Office action of June 23, 2004

IV.   STATUS OF THE AMENDMENTS

An Amendment after Notice of Appeal was filed on October 27, 2004.

138609 01/1662.15100   Page 6 of 25   HP PDNO 200304309-1

PAGE 9/28 * RCVD AT 11/16/2004 3:25:29 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/4 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:7132388008 * DURATION (mm-ss):07-50

Appl. No. 09/483,063
Appeal Brief dated November 16, 2004
Reply to final Office action of June 23, 2004

V. SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Computer manufacturers and software vendors implement software delivery systems that provide software to new computers. At least some issues related to such software delivery systems include security (*i.e.*, the software should only be accessible to the purchaser or to the purchaser's computer), customization (*i.e.*, a purchaser should be able to select the software included with the computer), speed of delivery, and cost (*i.e.*, mass producing digital storage devices, such as CD-ROMs, is faster and costs less than producing customized digital storage devices).

As described in claim 1, embodiments of the invention provide a "software delivery system" comprising, a digital storage device 20 containing a plurality of software products 24, the software products 24 each having been assigned a unique identifier 26 (see at least Figure 1 and page 9, lines 16-20). The software delivery system further comprises a computer system 5, the computer system 5 having a drive 12 for reading data stored on the digital storage device 20, a processor 10, a hard drive 14 and a non-volatile memory 16, the computer system 5 having pre-stored before installation of the software products 24 at least one but not all identifiers 28 corresponding to the identifiers 26 of said software products 24 in said non-volatile memory 16 (see at least Figure 1, page 9, lines 6-15, page 9, line 21 – page 10, line 4, and page 12, line 12 – page 13, line 11). When the digital storage device 20 is read by said drive 12, the software products 24 having an identifier 26 which corresponds to the at least one identifier 28 stored in the non-volatile memory 16 is loaded onto the computer system 5 (see at least Figure 1, Figure 2 and page 14, line 6 – page 15, line 13).

As described in claim 8, embodiments of the invention provide a software delivery system that comprises a digital storage device 20 containing a plurality of software modules 24 containing at least one software product in each of the modules 24, each of the software modules 24 having been assigned a unique identifier 26 (see at least Figure 1 and page 9, lines 16-20). Therefore, software modules 24 rather than individual software products are assigned a unique identifier such that when the digital storage device 20 is read by a drive 12, the at

least one software product from the software module 24 having an identifier 26 when corresponds to the identifier 28 stored in the non-volatile memory 16 is loaded onto the computer system 5 (see at least Figure 2 and page 14, line 6 – page 15, line 13).

As described in claim 15, embodiments of the invention provide a process for facilitating a delivery of custom-ordered software products to a computer system. The process comprises writing a set of software products onto a digital storage device (step 42), the set of software products containing at least one custom-ordered software product and other software products (see at least Figure 2 and page 12, lines 10-19). The process further comprises assigning a unique identifier for each software product in the digital storage device (step 42) and writing only the identifiers of the custom-ordered software products into the non-volatile memory of the computer system (steps 52 and 54) (see at least Figure 2 and page 12, line 20 – page 13, line 1). The process further comprises installing the custom-ordered software products having identifiers that match the identifiers in the non-volatile memory but not installing the other software products (step 72 – step 86) (see at least Figure 3, and page 14, line 19 – page 15, line 13).

As described in claim 20, embodiments of the invention provide a system 5 comprising a processor 10 and a storage 16 coupled to the processor 10 and configured to contain a plurality of software identifiers 28 before a consumer receives the system 5 (see at least Figure 1, page 9, lines 6-15 and lines 21-25). The system 5 is configured to receive a removable storage device 20 containing software products 24, each software product 24 having an associated software identifier 26 that is unique to each software product 24 (see at least Figure 1 and page 9, lines 16-20). The processor 10 is adapted to install software products 24 from the removable storage device 20 that have software identifiers 26 that match software identifiers 28 stored in the system's storage 16, but not install those software products 24 that do not have software identifiers 28 that match software identifiers 28 stored in the system's storage 16 (see at least Figure 1, Figure 2 and page 14, line 6 – page 15, line 13).

Appl. No. 09/483,063
Appeal Brief dated November 16, 2004
Reply to final Office action of June 23, 2004

As described in claim 24, embodiments of the invention provide a method comprising comparing identifiers 28 stored in a memory with identifiers 26 of a plurality of software products 24 (see at least Figure 1, steps 74-80 of Figure 2 and page 14, line 19 – page 15, line 4). The method further comprises installing each software product 24 in a computer system 5 only if an identifier 26 of the software product 24 matches with the identifiers 28 stored in the memory 16 (see Figure 1, step 86 of Figure 2 and page 15, lines 4-12). The method further comprises after installing each software product 24, adding one or more identifiers 28 into the memory 16 to install new software products (see step 90 – step 104 of Figure 4 and page 15, line 14 – page 17, line 5).

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Whether claims 24 and 25 are anticipated by Yoshida et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,075,862).

Whether claims 1-14 are unpatentable over Yoshida et al. in view of Santon et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,058,162) and Mullor et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,411,941).

Whether claims 15-23 are unpatentable over O'Connor (U.S. Pat. No. 5,894,571) in view of Day et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,016,400) and Mullor et al.

Appl. No. 09/483,063
Appeal Brief dated November 16, 2004
Reply to final Office action of June 23, 2004

VII. ARGUMENT

1. The Examiner erred in rejecting claims 1-14 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,075,862 ("Yoshida") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,085,162 ("Santon") and U.S. Patent No. 6,411,941 ("Mullor"). The references cited by the Examiner are summarized below.

1.A Yoshida

Yoshida teaches distributing encrypted software 100 to a personal computer 11. In the personal computer 11, a decryption key memory unit 13 is provided in a region of a hard disk device 12 (see Figure 1, col. 5, lines 34-42 and col. 5, line 63-col. 6, line 2). The decryption key memory unit 13 stores the software ID of each encrypted software which was installed once and is utilized in decrypting the encrypted software 100 to be re-installed (see col. 6, lines 3-11).

1.B Santon

Santon teaches a software distribution method that employs two levels of encryption keys, a specially adapted reading device and a password verification procedure (see Figure 2 and col. 2, lines 12-51). Data files on distributed media are encrypted and only the specially adapted reading devices are capable of reading the data files in a usable form (see col. 2, lines 12-23). The first encryption key level is provided with the media (see col. 2, lines 24-25). The second encryption key level is provided with the specially adapted reading device (see col. 2, lines 26-27). In addition to the encryption keys, Santon employs the password verification procedure to limit a customer's access to only certain data files of a particular media release (see col. 2, lines 38-51). Therefore, a software distributor can designate different file group access of a media release for different customers (see col. 2, lines 32-37).

1.C Mullor

Mullor teaches a method of restricting software operation within a license limitation. The method uses a unique identification code assigned to a computer to encrypt a program's license record (see col. 1, lines 43-65), producing an encrypted license key. When the program is executed on the computer, a license verifier retrieves the license record and encrypts the license record using the

unique identification code (see col. 2, lines 10-26). If both encrypted license keys match, the program is verified to run on the computer (see col. 2, lines 19-20). This method prevents a hacker from running a copy of the program on an unauthorized computer because an encrypted license key copied from the authorized computer will not match the encrypted license key produced by the license verifier if the copied program is executed on the unauthorized computer (see col. 2, lines 36-59).

1.D   Claims 1-7

Claim 1 requires "a digital software product containing a plurality of software products, said software products each having been assigned a unique identifier" and "a computer system having pre-stored before installation of the software products at least one but not all identifiers corresponding to the identifiers of said software products in said non-volatile memory." Claim 1 further requires "when said digital storage device is read by said drive, the software products having an identifier which corresponds to the at least one identifier stored in the non-volatile memory is loaded onto said computer system."

Yoshida does not teach a computer system having pre-stored before installation of the software product at least one identifier corresponding to the identifier of the software product as suggested by the Examiner (see Office action, page 5, first paragraph). Yoshida specifically teaches that the decryption key memory unit 13 stores the software ID of each encrypted software which was installed once and is utilized in decrypting the encrypted software 100 to be re-installed. Thus, the software ID in Yoshida is not "pre-stored before installation of the software products" as required in claim 1.

While Mullor teaches that each computer pre-stores a unique identification code, the unique identification code corresponds to a host computer and does not correspond to "identifiers of software products" as required in claim 1. The encrypted license record taught in Mullor appears to be associated with a program already residing in volatile memory (e.g., a hard-drive) and, therefore, relates to a program that has been installed (see col. 2, line 62 - col. 3, line 3 and col. 6, line 63). Thus, the encrypted license record does not teach or suggest

"pre-stor[ing] before installation of the software products at least one but not all identifiers corresponding to the identifiers of said software products in said non-volatile memory" as required in claim 1.

The Examiner does not appear to address the limitation "pre-stor[ing] before installation of the software products <u>at least one but not all</u> identifiers corresponding to the identifiers of said software products in said non-volatile memory" as required in claim 1. The Examiner mentions that Santon teaches multiple data files, not all of which a recipient is entitled to (see Office action, page 5, third paragraph). Santon, however, controls access to the multiple data files based on two levels of encryption keys, a specially adapted reading device and a password verification procedure. None of the references cited by the Examiner, nor combinations of the references, teaches or suggest "pre-stor[ing] before installation of the software products at least one but not all identifiers corresponding to the identifiers of said software products in said non-volatile memory" as required in claim 1.

The Examiner appears to be distilling Appellant's invention down to a "gist" or "thrust" in violation of the requirement to consider the claimed invention as a whole (MPEP 2141.02). None of the references cited by the Examiner, nor combinations of the references, teaches or suggests "a digital software product containing a plurality of software products, said software products each having been assigned a unique identifier" and "a computer system having pre-stored before installation of the software products at least one but not all identifiers corresponding to the identifiers of said software products in said non-volatile memory" as required in claim 1. For at least these reasons, the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 1 and its dependent claims. Based on the foregoing, Appellants respectfully submit that the rejections of the claims in this first grouping be reversed, and the claims set for issue.

1.E   Claims 8-14

Claim 8, in part, relates to groupings of software products referred to as "software modules." Claim 8 requires "a digital storage device containing a plurality of software modules containing at least one software product in each of

said modules, each of said software modules having been assigned a unique identifier" and "a computer system, said computer system having a drive for reading data stored on said digital storage device, a processor, a hard drive and a non-volatile memory, said computer system pre-storing before loading the software modules at least one identifier in said non-volatile memory which corresponds to at least one but not all identifiers of said software modules." Claim 8 further requires that "when said digital storage device is read by said drive, the at least one software product from the software module having an identifier which corresponds to the identifier stored in the non-volatile memory is loaded onto said computer system."

As described previously, Yoshida teaches a decryption key memory unit 13 that stores the software ID of each encrypted software which was installed once and is utilized in decrypting the encrypted software 100 to be re-installed. Thus, Yoshida does not teach or suggest "pre-storing before loading the software modules at least one identifier in said non-volatile memory which corresponds to at least one but not all identifiers of said software modules" as required in claim 8.

While Mullor teaches that each computer pre-stores a unique identification code, the unique identification code corresponds to a host computer and does not correspond to "identifiers of said software modules" as required in claim 8. Also, the encrypted license record taught in Mullor appears to be stored after an associated program is loaded in volatile memory (see col. 2, line 62 - col. 3, line 3 and col. 6, line 63) and, thus, does not teach or suggest "pre-storing before loading the software modules at least one identifier in said non-volatile memory which corresponds to at least one but not all identifiers of said software modules" as required in claim 8.

The Examiner does not appear to address the limitation "pre-storing before loading the software modules at least one identifier in said non-volatile memory which corresponds to at least one but not all identifiers of said software modules." Santon teaches accessing multiple data files based on two levels of encryption keys, a specially adapted reading device and a password verification procedure, but does not clearly teach or suggest "pre-storing...in said non-volatile

memory...at least one but not all identifiers of said software modules" as required in claim 8. None of the references cited by the Examiner, nor combinations of the references, teaches or suggests these limitations.

The Examiner appears to be distilling Appellant's invention down to a "gist" or "thrust" in violation of the requirement to consider the claimed invention as a whole (MPEP 2141.02). None of the references cited by the Examiner, nor combinations of the references, teaches or suggests "a digital storage device containing a plurality of software modules containing at least one software product in each of said modules, each of said software modules having been assigned a unique identifier" and "a computer system...said computer system pre-storing before loading the software modules at least one identifier in said non-volatile memory which corresponds to at least one but not all identifiers of said software modules." For at least these reasons, the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 8 and its dependent claims. Based on the foregoing, Appellants respectfully submit that the rejections of the claims in this second grouping be reversed, and the claims set for issue.

2. The Examiner erred in rejecting claims 15-23 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,894,571 ("O'Connor") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,016,400 ("Day") and Mullor. The references cited by the Examiner are summarized below.

2.A O'Connor

O'Connor teaches a method for providing a computer with custom hardware and custom software. The custom hardware is assigned an identification number. The identification number of the custom hardware is written to a CD-ROM containing the custom software. By matching the identification numbers, the custom software is provided to a computer having the custom hardware (see Figure 2).

2.B Day

Day discloses a method for preloading (during manufacture) operating system software. To preload the operating system a CD-ROM and a diskette are inserted into a computer. The CD-ROM contains a plurality of software programs (e.g., operating system, application software, other software). The diskette

contains execution files that determine which of the software programs are installed onto a computer. The computer is turned on and software from the CD-ROM is booted as determined by the execution files on the diskette (see Figure 3 and col. 4, lines 10-42).

2.C   Mullor

A summary of Mullor was provided previously.

2.D   Claims 15-19

Claim 15, in part, requires "writing a set of software products onto a digital storage device, said set of software products containing at least one custom-ordered software product and other software products" and "assigning a unique identifier for each software product in said digital storage device." Claim 15 further requires "writing only the identifiers of said custom-ordered software products into the non-volatile memory of said computer system," "comparing said identifiers in said non-volatile memory with said identifiers of the software products stored on the digital storage device" and "installing the custom-ordered software products having identifiers that match identifiers in said non-volatile memory but not installing the other software products."

The Examiner recognizes that O'Connor does not teach "writing a set of software products onto a digital storage device, said set of software products containing at least one custom-ordered software product and other software products" as required in claim 15, but contends that Day teaches this limitation (see Office action, page 11). However, Day specifically teaches two separate digital storage devices. The CD-ROM contains a complete set of software and the diskette contains execution files that determine which software from the CD-ROM is booted (see col. 3, lines 32-47). Neither, the CD-ROM nor the diskette appears to contain "at least one custom-ordered software product and other software products" as required in claim 15. Further, Day seems to suggest that combining the CD-ROM and the diskette is undesirable because the diskettes already exist and one copy of the CD-ROM image is preferred (see col. 2, lines 29-33).

The Examiner recognizes that O'Connor does not teach "writing only the identifiers of said custom-ordered software products into the non-volatile memory of said computer system" as required in claim 15, but contends that Mullor teaches this limitation (see Office action, page 12, second paragraph). Mullor does not teach or suggest "writing only the identifiers of said custom-ordered software products into the non-volatile memory" as required in claim 15 at least because the unique identification code taught in Mullor corresponds to a computer system and not to software products as suggested by the Examiner.

The Examiner appears to be distilling Appellant's invention down to a "gist" or "thrust" in violation of the requirement to consider the claimed invention as a whole (MPEP 2141.02). None of the references cited by the Examiner, nor combinations of the references, teaches or suggests "writing a set of software products onto a digital storage device, said set of software products containing at least one custom-ordered software product and other software products," "assigning a unique identifier for each software product in said digital storage device," "writing only the identifiers of said custom-ordered software products into the non-volatile memory of said computer system," "comparing said identifiers in said non-volatile memory with said identifiers of the software products stored on the digital storage device" and "installing the custom-ordered software products having identifiers that match identifiers in said non-volatile memory but not installing the other software products." For at least these reasons, the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 15 and its dependent claims. Based on the foregoing, Appellants respectfully submit that the rejections of the claims in this third grouping be reversed, and the claims set for issue.

2.E   Claims 20-23

Claim 20, in part, requires "storage coupled to the processor and configured to contain a plurality of software identifiers before a consumer receives the system[,] wherein said system is adapted to receive a removable storage device containing software products, each software product having an associated software identifier that that is unique to each software product." Claim 20 further requires "the processor is adapted to install software products from the removable

Appl. No. 09/483,063
Appeal Brief dated November 16, 2004
Reply to final Office action of June 23, 2004

storage device that have software identifiers that match software identifiers stored in the system's storage, but not install those software products from the removable storage device that do not have software identifiers that match software identifiers stored in the system's storage."

None of the references cited by the Examiner, nor combinations of the references, teaches or suggests "storage coupled to the processor and configured to contain a plurality of software identifiers before a consumer receives the system." Again, the unique identification code taught in Mullor corresponds to a computer system and not to software products as suggested by the Examiner. While Mullor teaches that the unique identification code is used to create an encrypted license record, Mullor does not clearly teach whether the encrypted license record is stored "before a customer receives the system" as required in claim 20.

The Examiner appears to be distilling Appellant's invention down to a "gist" or "thrust" in violation of the requirement to consider the claimed invention as a whole (MPEP 2141.02). None of the references cited by the Examiner, nor combinations of the references, teaches or suggests "storage coupled to the processor and configured to contain a plurality of software identifiers before a consumer receives the system" and "the processor is adapted to install software products from the removable storage device that have software identifiers that match software identifiers stored in the system's storage, but not install those software products from the removable storage device that do not have software identifiers that match software identifiers stored in the system's storage." For at least these reasons, the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 20 and its dependent claims. Based on the foregoing, Appellants respectfully submit that the rejections of the claims in this fourth grouping be reversed, and the claims set for issue.

3.   The Examiner erred in rejecting claims 24-25 as being anticipated by Yoshida. A summary of Yoshida was provided previously.

3.A   Claims 24-25

Claim 24 requires "comparing identifiers in a memory with identifiers of a plurality of software products," "installing each software product in a computer

Appl. No. 09/483,063
Appeal Brief dated November 16, 2004
Reply to final Office action of June 23, 2004

system only if an identifier of the software product matches with the identifiers stored in the memory" and "after installing each software product, adding one or more identifiers into the memory to install new software products.

Yoshida describes storing a software ID and a decryption key after an encrypted software has been installed. Thus, Yoshida does not teach or suggest "installing each software product in a computer system only if an identifier of the software product matches with the identifiers stored in the memory" as required in claim 24. For at least this reason, the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 24 and its dependent claim. Based on the foregoing, Appellants respectfully submit that the rejections of the claims in this fifth grouping be reversed, and the claims set for issue.

Appl. No. 09/483,063
Appeal Brief dated November 16, 2004
Reply to final Office action of June 23, 2004

VIII. CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, Appellants respectfully submit that the Examiner erred in rejecting all pending claims. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Alan D. Christenson
PTO Reg. No. 54,036
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
AGENT FOR APPELLANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

138609.01/1663.15100 **Page 20 of 25** HP PDNO 200304009-1

PAGE 23/28 * RCVD AT 11/16/2004 3:25:29 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/4 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:7132388008 * DURATION (mm-ss):07-50

Appl. No. 09/483,063
Appeal Brief dated November 16, 2004
Reply to final Office action of June 23, 2004

IX.   CLAIMS APPENDIX

1.   (Previously presented) A software delivery system comprising:

a digital storage device containing a plurality of software products, said software products each having been assigned a unique identifier; and

a computer system, said computer system having a drive for reading data stored on said digital storage device, a processor, a hard drive and a non-volatile memory, said computer system having pre-stored before installation of the software products at least one but not all identifiers corresponding to the identifiers of said software products in said non-volatile memory;

whereby when said digital storage device is read by said drive, the software products having an identifier which corresponds to the at least one identifier stored in the non-volatile memory is loaded onto said computer system.

2.   (Original) The software delivery system as recited in Claim 1 wherein said non-volatile memory may be updated to include additional identifiers.

3.   (Original) The software delivery system as recited in Claim 1 wherein said non-volatile memory is read-only memory.

4.   (Original) The software delivery system as recited in Claim 1 wherein said identifier in said non-volatile memory is encrypted.

5.   (Original) The software delivery system as recited in Claim 2 further comprising an update module for updating said non-volatile memory to include additional identifiers.

6.   (Original) The software delivery system as recited in Claim 1 further comprising a serial number stored in said computer system.

7.   (Original) The software delivery system as recited in Claim 6 wherein said serial number is stored in said non-volatile memory of said computer system.

8.   (Previously presented) A software delivery system comprising:
    a digital storage device containing a plurality of software modules containing at least one software product in each of said modules, each of said software modules having been assigned a unique identifier; and
    a computer system, said computer system having a drive for reading data stored on said digital storage device, a processor, a hard drive and a non-volatile memory, said computer system pre-storing before loading the software modules at least one identifier in said non-volatile memory which corresponds to at least one but not all identifiers of said software modules;
    whereby when said digital storage device is read by said drive, the at least one software product from the software module having an identifier which corresponds to the identifier stored in the non-volatile memory is loaded onto said computer system.

9.   (Original) The software delivery system as recited in Claim 8 wherein said non-volatile memory may be updated to include additional identifiers.

10.   (Original) The software delivery system as recited in Claim 8 wherein said non-volatile memory is read-only-memory.

11.   (Original) The software delivery system as recited in Claim 8 wherein said identifier in said non-volatile memory is encrypted.

12.   (Original) The software delivery system as recited in Claim 9 further comprising an update module for updating said non-volatile memory to include additional identifiers.

13. (Original) The software delivery system as recited in Claim 8 further comprising a serial number stored in said computer system.

14. (Original) The software delivery system as recited in Claim 13 wherein said serial number is stored in said non-volatile memory of said computer system.

15. (Previously presented) A process for facilitating a delivery of custom-ordered software products to a computer system, said computer system having a processor, a digital storage drive, a hard disk, and a non-volatile memory, said process comprising the steps of:

writing a set of software products onto a digital storage device, said set of software products containing at least one custom-ordered software product and other software products;

assigning a unique identifier for each software product in said digital storage device;

writing only the identifiers of said custom-ordered software products into the non-volatile memory of said computer system;

inserting said digital storage device into said digital storage drive;

reading said identifiers in said non-volatile memory of said computer system;

comparing said identifiers in said non-volatile memory with said identifiers of the software products stored on the digital storage device; and

installing the custom-ordered software products having identifiers that match the identifiers in said non-volatile memory but not installing the other software products.

16. (Previously presented) The method as recited in Claim 15 wherein said set of software products is written onto said digital storage device before said custom-ordered software is ordered by a customer.

Appl. No. 09/483,063
Appeal Brief dated November 16, 2004
Reply to final Office action of June 23, 2004

17. (Previously presented) The method as recited in Claim 15 further comprising the step of testing the set of software products before it is written onto said digital storage device.

18. (Original) The method as recited in Claim 15 wherein said identifier in said non-volatile memory is encrypted.

19. (Previously presented) The method as recited in Claim 15 further comprising the step of checking a serial number of said computer system before executing said step of writing the identifier of said custom-ordered software products into the non-volatile memory of said computer system.

20. (Previously presented) A system, comprising:
 a processor;
 storage coupled to the processor and configured to contain a plurality of
  software identifiers before a consumer receives the system;
 wherein said system is adapted to receive a removable storage device
  containing software products, each software product having an
  associated software identifier that is unique to each software
  product; and
 wherein the processor is adapted to install software products from the
  removable storage device that have software identifiers that match
  software identifiers stored in the system's storage, but not install
  those software products from the removable storage device that do
  not have software identifiers that match software identifiers stored
  in the system's storage.

21. (Previously presented) The system of claim 20 wherein the processor compares the software identifiers stored on the removable storage device to the software identifiers stored in the system storage.

Appl. No. 09/483,063
Appeal Brief dated November 16, 2004
Reply to final Office action of June 23, 2004

22.   (Previously presented) The system of claim 20 wherein the processor is adapted to a execute a program that causes the processor to store additional software identifiers in the system's storage that were previously not stored in the system's storage.

23.   (Previously presented) The system of claim 22 wherein the additional software identifiers allows installation of at least one previously unavailable software product stored on the removable storage device.

24.   (Previously presented) A method, comprising:
    comparing identifiers stored in a memory with identifiers of a plurality of
        software products;
    installing each software product in a computer system only if an identifier
        of the software product matches with the identifiers stored in the
        memory; and
    after said installing each software product, adding one or more identifiers
        into the memory to install new software products.

25.   (Previously presented) The method of claim 24 further comprising comparing a serial number of the computer system with a serial number provided by a user and only adding said one or more identifiers into the memory if the serial numbers match.

HP PDNO 200304308-1

138609.01/1662.15100